# UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

*Editors*

John Haynes Holmes  Francis Neilson

## Religion in Australia

*By* HARRY TAYLOR

## War, the Limit of Idiocy!

*By* HENRY W. PINKHAM

## Fathers and Sons: A Case of Neophobia

*By* DAVID GITTLEMAN

VOLUME XCV  NUMBER 4

Chicago, March 23, 1925

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

# UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 66 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Robert B. Whitaker
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

*"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"*

## UNITY Fellowship Associates

### BOND OF UNION

**We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.**

**The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.**

**UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.**

**Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.**

**All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.**

**Name** .....

**Address** .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) .....

Address .....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

## *Contents*

EDITORIAL—

Notes ..... 51
Jottings.—J. W. F. ..... 53
Editorial Correspondence—American Notes.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG ..... 54

ARTICLES—

A Social Confession of Faith.—REV. CURTIS W. REESE 51
The Story of My Mind. IV.—GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.. 56
Religion in Australia.—REV. HARRY TAYLOR..... 58
War, the Limit of Idiocy!—REV. HENRY W. PINKHAM 59
Fathers and Sons: A Case of Neophobia.—DAVID GITTLEMAN ..... 60

POETRY—

In One Another's Love.—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.... 57
War.—*Witter Bynner* ..... 64

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Charming Book.—MARY WHITE OVINGTON..... 61

CORRESPONDENCE—

An Appeal for Judge Lindsey.—JAMES M. WILLIAMS 62
A New Hymnal.—J. HARRY HOOPER..... 62
Need of an International Opium Congress in America.—MARY K. DAS..... 62

THE FIELD—

A Morel Memorial Resolution..... 63
To Study the Science of Peace..... 63
International Fellowship of Reconciliation..... 64

# UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCV MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1925 NUMBER 4

### A SOCIAL CONFESSION OF FAITH

(1) I believe in scientific control of human evolution, not in "economic determinism."

(2) I believe in world-wide community of interests, not in "class consciousness and conflict."

(3) I believe in social development through experimental democracy, not in the "cataclysmic theory" of social progress.

CURTIS W. REESE.

---

UNITY is happy to announce the accession to its group of Foreign Representatives of Mr. Theodor Hahn, of Germany. Mr. Hahn has been a resident of this country, and is thus familiar with American life and thought. Returning to his native land some three years ago, he has since been engaged in journalistic and literary work which has given him admirable opportunity to keep in touch with German affairs. Only a few weeks ago we referred in our column, "Jottings," to his recently published collection of the speeches and writings of Woodrow Wilson, entitled "Woodrow Wilson's Worte Als Rechtfertigung Der Revision Des Versailler Vertraus." Mr. Hahn is familiar with UNITY, and in hearty sympathy with its ideas and policies. His correspondence may be counted upon to be of genuine interest and importance.

---

The days are passing by, but the noise of General Dawes's performance in Washington on Inauguration Day still goes echoing down the corridors of time. One great achievement must be credited to the Chicago warrior—that of keeping in the limelight. For the Vice-President to secure full attention on the President's great day, and then to keep it after entering upon the routine duties of his office, is assuredly one of the ever-memorable deeds of American history. But at what a great price General Dawes attained his end! It was beautifully adapted to the necessities of the situation, for just as the one sure way of getting into the obituary columns of our newspapers is to die, so the one sure way of getting headline space on the front page is to make a fool of oneself. "The easiest thing in the world," says George Jean Nathan, in the March *Mercury* (page 372), "is to attract attention to one's self. All that one has to do, as has often been said, is to walk down Broadway without one's pants on." But isn't this a heavy price to pay, especially for a public official? Granted that everything that General Dawes said in his earthquake speech was justified by the situation in the Senate, we still insist that his utterance was discourteous, impudent, and indecent. We have never been strong on the proprieties ourselves, have little respect for conventions, and have never yet been charged with good taste, but even we can see the outrage which the Vice-President perpetrated on his accession to office. When it becomes proper and fitting for a clergyman to denounce his congregation as fools and knaves at his installation service, when it is a brave and gallant thing for a bridegroom to berate his bride before all the assembled guests at the marriage altar, when it becomes the custom for a gentleman, when introduced to a stranger, to laugh at his hat and criticize the cut of his clothes, then and only then, shall we believe that General Dawes was justified in what he did. The one comfort is that the Vice-President lived up to his reputation as a vulgarian.

---

But was General Dawes justified in what he said? Were his criticisms of the Senate sound? Was he a doughty reformer, displaying bad taste, to be sure, but in a good cause? We cannot think so. The rules of the Senate, against which the Vice-President hurled his attack, are probably not perfect. Few specimens of human handiwork in this world are perfect! It is probable that the rules are occasionally misused by selfish men for ugly purposes. We have heard that the institution of marriage is not always dedicated to highest ends and purposes! But if the Senate maintains distinction, as compared with the House, for example, in an age when our republican institutions are falling into sad disrepute—if the cause of liberalism still has a voice in the Senate, when that voice has been silenced in every other department of government—if the growing tyranny of the majority is here tempered by the full rights of the minority—it is for no other reason than that the Senate has insisted upon rigidly preserving its character as a deliberative body. In this chamber, if nowhere else, a measure or policy is threshed out to the bottom; and if some good bills are lost in the process, more bad bills are utterly destroyed. It is amusing to note that those who declaim loudest about the obstructive rules of the Senate, are just the ones who are always complaining that too many laws are being passed, that the legislative mill ought to be stopped for a while, etc., etc. Well, if there is one

influence in Washington which saves the country from being absolutely swamped with new laws, it is the Senate. The rules of this body are a dam which holds back the flood of waters. Leave the rules alone. Clay and Webster and Benton and Sumner and Hoar, and now La Follette and Norris and Borah, have functioned and are functioning under these rules, and we are not complaining.

---

It may be well to consider just for a moment what is the reason for the recent violent attacks upon the Senate—why such dignified newspapers at the New York *Times* and *World,* for example, were pleased rather than otherwise by the demagogury of the Vice-President. This reason, as we look at it, is not far to seek! Some six years ago a man by the name of Woodrow Wilson brought back from a certain conference at Versailles the vilest peace treaty written since the fall of Carthage, and the covenant of an instrument (the League of Nations) for the carrying out of the provisions of this treaty. Everything was prepared for rushing these measures through. The people were tired of the war, eager to get it ended, and incidentally grossly ignorant as to the significance of the terms of settlement. The ways were greased as for the launching of a ship—except only in the Senate! Here stood a little group of men who saw the iniquity of what had been done, and were resolved to save the nation from the political and moral disaster impending. These men were magnificently led by Knox and Borah, but even so they could have accomplished nothing had it not been for the rules of the Senate. These enabled the so-called "irreconcileables" to secure a "stay of execution." In the interval of time thus won, by debates as able as any in the history of the Republic, the people of America were educated to understand what Versailles meant, and thus to rally to the cause a public opinion adequate to defeat both Treaty and Covenant. Woodrow Wilson was defeated by the rules of the Senate—and they have become forthwith the center of attack by Wilsonites everywhere. There is fortunately little chance of their being changed. Not while Senator Borah is in the Senate at any rate!

---

There is one other angle on this Senate matter which it may be well to mention. We refer to the easy and arrogant way in which the conservative forces of reaction in this country bully and brow-beat any officer or institution of government not yet wholly under their control, and the horror manifested by these same forces whenever any radical or liberal suggests any slightest criticism of this same government. In the last election, a panic was started over La Follett's very mild suggestions in regard to changing the procedure of declaring a law unconstitutional by fiat of the Supreme Court. The Republicans declared that the Progressive candidate was undermining the foundations of the republic, seeking the overthrow of orderly government, tearing up the Constitution and handing over the nation to Moscow, all because he wanted to take away from the nine men composing the Supreme Court, or any five of the nine, the power to block forever the will of Congress and the people. Now comes the Vice-President of the Republican administration, bellowing like the bull of Bashan in denunciation of the Senate for blocking legislation not forever but for a few weeks or months, and declaring for an utter revolution in rules and methods of procedure. The fact is that the Senate is the one branch of the United States government to-day which is not absolutely in the control of Big Business. General Dawes is simply a lackey of Big Business, presuming to read the riot act to a body that has not yet knuckled down and asked for orders. Overthrow the government? Big Business has already overthrown it, as an invading army overthrows and takes a fortress. One bastion, the Senate, still holds out—and the doughty General from Chicago spoke the summons to surrender on Inauguration Day. If the people do not know what all this means, they are bigger fools than we think them to be.

---

The most important revelation on the question of the causes of the Great War, and specific responsibility therefor, that has been made since the publication of the Russian archives in 1917, has recently appeared in England. In an article written and published in an English newspaper, Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs in the recent Labor Government, and thus Ramsay MacDonald's right-hand man, himself a noted student of international affairs, declares that Serbia was directly concerned in the murder of the Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo in 1914, and thus directly responsible for the outbreak of the Great War.

> "The President of the Serbian Parliament," writes Arthur Ponsonby, "has now confessed in writing that not only did the Serbian Government know of the murder plot, but they were a party to it. The crime was organized by the head of the Intelligence Section of the Serbian General Staff with the knowledge and connivance of the Serbian Prime Minister and his Government, and no warning was sent to Vienna to prevent the Archduke falling into the trap."

The importance of this revelation cannot be exaggerated. It definitely removes Serbia from the position of a hapless victim of the war, along with Belgium, and ranks her with the conspirators responsible for the horror. Professor Harry Elmer Barnes, of Smith College, in his famous article last year in *Current Affairs* declared that the order of responsibility for the war is Russia, Austria, France, Germany, and England. This rating of the international sinners must now be altered by placing Serbia between Russia and Austria, or perhaps even at the head of the list. In any case, the myth of German responsibility is given one more fatal blow.

We sympathize with the stout burgomen of Geneva! It would be a mistake to take the League of Nations away from this famous Swiss city. Our reasons for this opinon are very different, no doubt, from those moving the citizens of the place to protest, for these same citizens are probably thinking of trade and prestige, whereas we are thinking of the League itself. But the conclusion is the same—that the League of Nations should "stay put." The growth of the plant is weak enough as it is, heaven knows, without now being torn up by the roots and thrust afresh into alien soil. If it is to survive at all, it must be by the power of such tradition as it can pile up from year to year—such momentum as it can gather as the months pass by. The tradition now is feeble—the momentum wellnigh nonexistent—but such as they are, they are associated with Geneva, and separation we believe would be instantly fatal. As one who has been in Geneva and seen the League's Secretariat located on the shores of that lovely lake, with the Alps and Mt. Blanc on the horizon, with memories of the Reformation in the very air one breathes, it seems unthinkable that the League should seek another habitat. Surely this is a paradise—and a meeting place of nations! Did anything commend us quite so much to the League and its work as this *locale?* We can think of nothing, sentimental as this judgment may appear. Therefore do we think that the burgomen, for reasons good or bad, for motives selfish or unselfish, are right. The League has cast in its lot with Geneva, as Woodrow Wilson suggested in one of his most inspired moments. There let it stay, till it succeed or fail forever.

---

The Chicago *Tribune* recently printed a despatch from its Riga correspondent announcing the "death" of the Living Church of Russia, at the first organization conference of which the Editor of UNITY was present in 1922. The fact that this story came from Riga was ample proof of its falsehood. Now comes a statement from Dr. L. O. Hartman, Editor of *Zion's Herald,* who has kept closely in touch with the reformed religious movement in Russia since his visit to that country in 1923, pointing out that within the five printers' "sticks" of this *Tribune* despatch there are no less than a dozen errors. An average of over two errors per "stick" is not bad for a despatch about the Soviets. Still, it has its disquieting aspects! Correcting some of these errors, Dr. Hartman points out that the Living Church is not dead at all, but has only joined the larger and more inclusive liberal movement among Russian churchmen known as the Reformed Orthodox Church. This occurred as long ago as May, 1923. So far from the liberal forces "showing acute anemia," as the Riga correspondent affirms, these forces are active and vigorous, as is demonstrated by the increased enrollment in the theological schools at Moscow and Leningrad, already referred to in these columns. The correspondent accuses the Methodists of having kept the Living Church alive by gifts of forty thousand dollars contributed by "thousands of Americans." Dr. Hartman consults the books and discovers that 876 individuals have contributed to a fund, of which only $15,166.64 has been sent to Russia. All other moneys have been raised by the Russian leaders themselves in support of their own work. Could anything be more amusing than this kind of "news" out of Russia? And yet is it amusing? Rather is it tragic, for tens of thousands read the *Tribune* story to every one who reads the *Zion's Herald* correction. Hence the fog of lies behind which the truth about Russia is hidden!

## Jottings

In a so-called Veterans' Hospital maintained by the Government in New York state there is a man who served in the A. E. F. He fought in famous battles, fought, they say, like a tiger; and he was not wounded. His present trouble is wholly mental. He wanders about all day and half the night murmuring: "It's a lie! It never happened! It couldn't have happened!" New patients, hearing him, ask: "What does he mean? What is it that he says never happened?" The old-timers answer briefly: "The war, of course."

---

"I'm for the Klan," said a man on the train the other evening. "When I was a boy the 'Micks' kicked me around, so now I want to kick them around." There was no passion in his voice.

---

In a town in Maine there was a boy who had never developed—he had the mind of a child two or three years old. His brother was hurt in a railway accident, lost his legs; the family and the neighbors pitied him, tried to be kind to him in their simple way. Strange "ideas" revolved in the pigmy brain of the "innocent"; he was jealous of his crippled brother; he wanted people to give *him* their attention. One day he went down to the freight yard and threw himself under a train. Of course, he was killed.

---

A dear old colored woman who worked for my Mother when I was a child taught me the expression: "Lawdy!" Only the other day did it occur to me that the word is derived from the phrase: "Laus Deo." You remember that the young sons of rich Southern planters often went to Harrow and Eton for a classical education; they must have brought their Latin home with them.

J. W. F.

# American Notes

Editorial Correspondence

Scott Nearing has been here, Seattle—Feb. 23 to 26. He has gone from here to spend three days each in San Francisco and Los Angeles. There was a public reception given to him on the first evening at Meves Cafeteria, under the auspices of the Labor College, the Commonwealth club, the Fellowship and other organizations. He gave three set lectures in Eagles Hall, spoke to students in the "Y" at the university on Tuesday noon, to the Fellowship at the city "Y" on Wednesday noon—together with a lot of little side talks. The meetings have been well attended and the audiences enthusiastic.

I heard him four times. In the first place I went for my own sake, next for the sake of The Labor college that under the guidance of John C. Kennedy sponsored the meetings. I was drawn also by the method of the speaker and his power of teaching. I was quite glad too to go over the road traversed by Mr. Nearing with the aim of getting the reaction. I was not disappointed in the last particular; for he is certainly a stimulating guide, with a lot of grand views and mental jolts thrown in.

Of course, all through his lectures I was regretting that such a man was unacceptable to the universities of the land. I am thinking of the loss to them, not to him, for undoubtedly he is reaching a bigger world as it is than if he had a soft seat in Harvard or Leland Stanford. But a man of such teaching power and inspirational energy is so dreadfully needed in the big educational pools of the land, to stir up thought and create bravery of expression. But, alas—I was reading only yesterday of Jesus' visit to his home town, when he just got out of town, by a hair's breadth escape, and dropped that immortal remark about the "prophet without honor etc." There was a jam at the reception, when Mr. Nearing spoke of his recent trip through Canada, he having come by the glorious Selkirks and Canadian Rockies. Only a week previous, he had heard the new president, Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, in Boston, who in the course of a long address never mentioned the "labor movement." Canada was to him a great contrast and very refreshing. He found the farmers, from Winnepeg to Vancouver, forming the "left" of the "labor movement." Seventy percent of the farms are mortgaged. The labor movement, in Canada, is militant and intelligent. Coming from Canada had re-emphasized the fact that the labor movement of the United States was the most reactionary of all the labor movements of the world. He referred to the big salaries of the officials of the American Federation, many of these salaries hovering around $10,000 and Warren Stone's salary being $25,000. "Such men cannot represent Labor," he declared. When the Mexican delegates—a thousand of them—were crossing the big river to visit the A. F. of L. they were stopped for a while, on the ground that they were "not delegates, but just workers." When they looked around upon the members of the convention, they remarked, "these are not workers, they are bankers."

To give even an outline of Mr. Nearing's lectures or to give thorough analysis of his power would be impossible, in this space. A few impressions and reflections however will be good reading, I trust. Every hearer feels that he has had a real trip, in every lecture. He started somewhere, went somewhere and got more than the worth of his money. He has received a lot of information, also a lot of jolts that woke him up and has gone home to think or to talk it over with a group long after midnight. Mr. Nearing is more stimulating than a strong cup of coffee.

For example, take his second lecture, in which he shows the passing of the present order, which he names "civilization." He makes a fascinating epic of the story as he carries the hearer through the various eras, named "savagery," "barbarism," and now "civilization." The cornerstone of "civilization" is "capitalism." The time has come for "civilization" to pass. Some time in the future, men will say, as we say of "barbarism" and "savagery," "Thank God, they are over"—so will be said, "Thank God, civilization is past." Humanity is getting ready for a new social order. Millions are now ready to step out of our present "civilization" into the new social order.

The first task of the new order will be to provide employment and the necessities of life to everyone. This will be only the ground-work, the foundation, for the new order. Upon this foundation will be built the new social structure. When poverty is erased, the arts, crafts, sciences, culture will flourish. Mr. Nearing got a round of applause, when he said, "Man learned to talk in the savage stage, in barbarism he learned to write and draw pictures; now he is beginning to learn to think."

One hour of lecturing and one hour of quizzing constituted the regular bill of fare. Mr. Nearing is very expert in both hours. His last lecture was the best attended. It was on "The League of Nations or the League of Industries." It gave him a chance as an economist, socialist and prophet to reveal the weakness of the present civilization and prove the necessity for a new order. The League of Nations, he claimed, has not accomplished what it was supposed to do: reduce militarism, protect small peoples and reduce struggle between big nations. It has not accomplished anyone of these. Militarism is growing, nowhere more than in the United States. The League of Nations does not work, because "nationality" does not work. The term "nation" is becoming obsolete. The League of Nations is really a "League of Obstacles."

A league that will efficiently function must be organized along the line of realities, of what people are actually doing . . . world questions are now questions of oil, transport, finance, coal. A real functioning league must be a league of industries . . . Hundred percent nationalism is hostile to the worldizing of humanity. The League of Nations is a political document; a functioning league will have an industrial document. The League of Nations is not big enough to do the job. Industry, not geography, is important. It is a problem in engineering. The job is to use nature to the highest advantage. The people most competent to do this are the people on the job—the workers.

Whatever Mr. Nearing tackled he did it with a men-

tal grip, a wealth of information, a brave abandon to the truth and a plain man's vocabulary that was amazing and exhilarating. It was the same when he spoke to a small group on Labor Defense in matters of freedom of speech, press and assembly. It was thoroughly done and ranged from the beginning of struggle for free speech to the syndicalist laws and prisoners in California and Washington. One student remarked, "Nearing is giving us what we cannot get at the university." He believes in political activity, since it affords apportunity for propaganda and also gives opportunity to be counted. He does not favor Foundations created by private endowments, because tending to control education.

He frankly said—when asked about the Asiatic problem and immigration—there should be freedom of migration, that the Chinese and Japanese had quite as much right to live and work on the American continent as Americans to go upon the Asiatic. Whatever group could "produce the most should be on that spot." This was cheered . . . Our educational institutions are training the students to remember, to obey and to forget. The students are barely away from the nursing bottle. All this makes it difficult to bring about a social change.

Naturally, I was interested in the noon-meeting when Mr. Nearing discussed, "What to do about war." He drew out a fine crowd of liberals and peace lovers,—among them many preachers, lawyers, teachers, business men, etc., who did not get into his regular lectures. The Japanese consul was there, who, by the way, is exceedingly democratic and expresses himself freely in all kinds of meetings. Mr. Nearing declared that war was organized destruction, that wars never end war. War is a disease. There is a surplus of poison in humanity's system. To dispose of war we must dispose of economic friction. There must be an organization of economic interests on a world basis. As long as monopolies exist there will be trouble. The liquidation of war involves the liquidation of resources. As long as many need food, clothing and shelter there will be friction. . . Meantime the nations are getting ready for war. The militarization of colleges is a sign. Forces are all set for a new war. Pacifism does not get on the front page nor in the movies, except to be condemned; preparedness does get on the front page, and the back page as well. . . There is more hope in the organized workers of the world than in any other organized agency.

What to do? Must be education in homes, schools, churches that will prevent war. In this era, war is the result of economic conflict. The masters of America's economic life are back of war propaganda. A statesmanlike way of treating war is to seek to produce an economic organization without friction, along the lines of co-operation, with production and distribution based on justice. As things are organized now, the schools and churches will be back of the next war. We must have new institutions. We are at present living in a world of Morgan and Pershing.

Having traveled three days with Mr. Nearing, I am asking myself how far I go with him. I'll be glad to give my conclusions. One splendid thing about him as a lecturer is that he drives the hearer to take a position. As for myself I find myself quite in agreement on several things. He is absolutely right; the present "civilization" (he is not ironical, simply classifying the present order) must go if mankind is to have peace. Further, I agree that there must come about a new society, in which there shall be co-operation, in which the processes of production and distribution shall be carried on with justice to all. A society without these things will be continually subject to friction, to war.

The real problem is how to get from one stage to the other, how to get into the new era, and what is equally important, how to *stay* there. In this particular problem, Mr. Nearing does not seem to get beyond economic forces as factors in bringing about the new order. Personally, I think one is compelled to go deeper, which does not mean something in antagonism, but something supplemental and deeper. I have for years felt that there was a fundamental unity between Marx and Jesus.

People are taking three roads to find social peace. 1. They are crying out against war, its horrors, etc. I agree, they will not get very far. Such people will doubtless be found "falling in" when the bugle blows for the next war. 2. Others—the socialists, for instance—are against wars because wars are of the capitalistic system which system they are opposing. But, when it comes to a "class-war" they are ready to fight, even ready to drill for it, saying that this class struggle will be the last one; the idea being that it will be a war to end war. On this last point, having seen one "war to end war," I have "me doubts." While my sympathies are with the workers and I hope and believe they will ultimately win, yet I am unwilling to commit the cause to economic forces alone; in fact, to do so I feel is to bring ultimate defeat. 3. Still others, while holding faithfully to the necessity of having a just economic organization,—one quite the opposite of the present capitalistic order,—propose a peace-plan for putting it over. The negative side to this program is the rigid adherence to the application of non-violence. The positive side consists in the rigid application of the principle, or force, of love. It is the failure to recognize the power of this latter principle that leads so many to turn to economic forces exclusively.

I agree with Mr. Nearing that man's next job is to get himself out of the stage of "civilization" into an economic commonwealth. I sincerely believe that the passage can be made best by non-violence and love. When any group resorts to violence, a certain power goes out of them. I notice this in the case of the I. W. W. of our state. Several years ago, when they were working their "fold your arms" tactics, they were well nigh invincible. They lost power, economic and moral, when they resorted to force, not that they have not been quite within their legal rights, but I am seeking simply to state a fact.

The peace plan I mention, is receiving too much reenforcement through Gandhi and the Quakers, etc., to forbid anyone working for the great change to fail seriously to consider it. All the forces that are gathering around the name of Marx—who emphasized material energies—and the forces that are gathering around the name of Jesus—who emphasized spiritual (not other worldism) energies—both of which are seeking a common goal, should, it seems to me, find a supplementary combination not only workable, but of the highest effectiveness, each supplying what the other may lack.

So not in criticism do I speak of Mr. Nearing—for whom I have the highest admiration—but to point to a realm of resources and power, ordinarily overlooked by the economist. A realm, not antagonistic, but at least supplementary, and maybe the necessary complement and cap of the economist's ideal social order.

SYDNEY STRONG.

# The Story of My Mind

IV.

It must not be thought that I spent all my time in reading, for I did my share of the farm work, though it was not as much as it might have been if I had not been drawn away by books. My father's farm was a small one, and the land was not of the most productive quality. Nominally it contained only 80 acres, twenty of these were included in the pond I have mentioned, produced by the overflow of a creek a mile or more to the south of us. The sixty acres produced too little to meet our needs, and, though the farm was supplemented by the coopering, I suspect there was a considerable deficit in each year's accounts. When I was about thirteen, my maternal grandmother died, and there was a division of the estate, which brought my parents 27 acres additional, on the opposite side of the road from our house, together with a woodlot of 40 acres more than a mile away. Half of the woodland was sold, but still the deficit seems to have gone on.

At the age of fifteen I became a "hired man" on one or another farm within two or three miles of my home. I do not think I was pushed or that more was demanded of me than I was able to accomplish. The work began at an early hour, and it was continued until dark, and sometimes to a later hour. To me it was irksome, uncongenial, and fretted me. My thoughts were elsewhere, and I felt certain that the farm was not my place. When my mother once said to me, "George, do you think you can be anything else than a farmer?" my reply was both prompt and positive, "Yes, I shall not be a farmer."

In the abstract I had no objection to farm life, but it did not command my whole interest. I believed thoroughly what I often heard my father assert, that the farmer was the mainstay and support of the nation. It was the being under the control and direction of others, the working for wages, the being regarded and treated as a "hired man," which ate into my soul, and made me feel discontented and bitter. I detested the life I was living, had no real interest in it, and was anxious to get away from it as soon as possible. The fact that I saw no promise of being able to do so, made the situation more intolerable, and I rebelled against it constantly in my own thoughts. I resolved that if I were ever able to escape from this most disagreeable life, and could find my way to a position of any influence whatever, I would champion with all my powers the cause of the workers who had to drudge hard and late, and with small return for their labor.

In the autumn after I had reached my eighteenth birthday an uncle, Oliver Young, assistant-superintendent of a railroad in Ohio, who had married one of my mother's younger sisters, briefly visited our neighborhood, and hearing of my desire to go to college, offered to furnish me money in order that I might do so for one year. He sent me $200.00, and with that sum I went to Olivet College in the autumn of 1866. Olivet came into existence under the same auspices as Oberlin, had the same founder, and stood for the same intense missionary zeal and reformatory demands. It was located in a small country village, which it had created and maintained. I chose Olivet because other boys in our neighborhood had been there and I had heard much about it. I entered the primary department, which taught the usual High School branches. I began in Latin, took a term in natural philosophy or what has since come to be designated as physics, and gave the whole year to the study of English grammar. The teaching was poor, the methods entirely unpedagogic, and the results less than they might have been. For instance, I was as eager as ever to learn to speak and write grammatically; but the teaching here as in the country school was wholly without application to the art of practical expression. We took sentences apart, but there was not the slightest attempt to show us how to put them together. The teaching in physics was of a quite inadequate character, and the instruments used even more so.

The college was connected with the Congregational denomination, the one church in the village was of that sect, and the atmosphere of college and village alike was distinctly orthodox. Many of the students were preparing to preach, and most of them came from the farms and villages of that part of the state, though a few were from the larger towns. Any student not a church member or professing an active belief in Christianity, was the subject of remark, if not of suspicion. Among the graduates in the summer of 1867 was John Henry Barrows, who was the president of the World's Parliament of Religions, held in connection with the Columbian Exposition at Chicago, in 1893. His brother, who also graduated at the same time, was a prominent preacher of his denomination.

The college gave me access to books, and these I availed myself of to as full an extent as possible. I joined the literary society of the students in the preparatory department, and was made the secretary. Already I had opinions of my own, and I may have asserted them with some conviction. One of the students was a son of my landlady, and when he reported one day that the president had advised the graduating class, of which he was a member, not to read "Ecce Homo," a book of liberal theology then recently published, I at once said, "I shall read anything I wish, whatever may be the advice of the president." The New York *Independent* came to my boarding-house, and I read it from week to week with the greatest interest, especially th "double-leaded" articles of the editor, Theodore Tilton. This young man, a protege of Henry Ward Beecher, was then a cause of much discussion amongst the Congregationalists, as well as in other denominations, because of what were regarded as his very advanced theological opinions, which he freely expressed in his paper.

What most interested me during my year at Olivet was the public lecture course, which was of a popular and educational character. In the village church, which was usually filled to its capacity, I heard Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglas, Tilton, Anna Dickinson, and other leading lecturers of the time. They discussed the live issues of the day, and set forth their ideas on those problems which were agitating the whole nation in the period immediately succeeding the Civil War. Of all these men Theodore Tilton pleased me most, with his splendid physique, his handsome and mobile face, his magnificent oratory, and his radical ideas, which he expressed in a bold and confident manner. Had he not come into conflict with Beecher in later years, shown himself lacking in moral character and practice, and retired to Paris a discredited and disappointed man, he might have become another of my heroes. A small

volume of mediocre verse is all which remains of a man who promised the greatest things in his early years.*

I returned home in the summer of 1867 with eighteen of the $200 with which I went to Olivet in the previous autumn. With that sum in my pocket I set out in the autumn for Jefferson, Wisconsin, where was located a Liberal Institute, which was under the auspices of the Universalist denomination in that State. There I spent the next three years in the attempt to secure an education without money. My uncle sent me $75, and my father gave me $100 when he sold his farm in 1869. I had in all, therefore, $375 with which to secure an education. I cared for the furnace in the church where the school had its sessions for the first two or three years of its existence; I swept it, lighted the lamps, did chores for one or another family where my services were desired, some of the time boarded myself, and made my way in my studies as best I could. Not being physically robust or in the best of health, and feeling in many ways the change from farm life to sedentary and studious occupations, I was not in the best condition for the work to which I was required to give attention. I was compelled to return home for a winter, then went back for a term or two, taught school for two years with little if any success, and then took up the professional studies which determined my occupation for many years.

At Jefferson I read many books which largely helped in determining my manner of thinking for the years to follow. Any and every kind of book had its attractions for me, but now I read somewhat more discriminatingly. However, all the books of which I heard, whatever their theories or doctrines, I sought for and devoured without regard to whether they were generally accepted and approved or not. Paine's "Age of Reason," Renan's "Jesus," Lecky's "Rationalism," and many another book of the same kind, won my attention and careful perusal. One of the men in a chair-factory of the town was Dempster Ostrander, who had a library of several hundred volumes which he loaned me freely. He became my friend until his death, and many a discussion we had on the most important topics. His house in Chicago was my home for many years whenever I was in that city, and generous was his treatment of me.

During one of the years of my stay in Jefferson I read with the Assistant-Principal of the Institute and her landlady, the "Liberty" of John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer's "Education." I read while the women busied themselves with their sewing or whatever else it may have been, and then we discussed freely the pages which had claimed out attention. These books deeply impressed me, and they intellectually confirmed the conclusions at which I had vaguely arrived as the results of my own experience and observation. They helped to make me a confirmed and thoroughly convinced individualist, and to make me impatient of all phases of life and thought opposed to the broadest liberty of opinion and expression. They also aided in making me a heretic in politics, education, and philosophy. In June following these readings, when the Institute students presented their essays and declamations at the end of the school year, I gave expression to the thoughts which Mill and Spencer had brought me, quoting freely from their pages. I suspect there was a large amount of adolescent froth and incendiarism expressed in what I read.

As I look back upon these years I am led to the conclusion that I was accepting and stating in my own crude way, what was the practical outcome of the pioneer life which had shaped the thoughts and the actions of the people about me. The settlers of the states along the Atlantic coast had left behind many of the traditions of Europe, and found many of the customs of the old world not fitted to the new conditions. The break had not been a complete one, however, and though it was sufficient to bring them into conflict with the mother country, there were retained many old aristocratic ideas and institutions. During the first three presidencies, under the guidance of the Federalist Party, there remained many restrictions upon suffrage and upon the holding of office, making property and religion limitations upon these privileges. With the invasion of the great central West there came a change in the direction of democracy, and Jefferson and Jackson led revolutions which largely changed the relations of the individual to the national life.

It was the bravest and boldest men and women who moved into the great West in search of land and economic liberty. A spirit of freedom, of intellectual and political emancipation followed inevitably, and made itself manifest in the Republican Party and in the Civil War. It also showed itself in a mental alertness and disregard of tradition, which in many ways guided the life of the newer states. Religion was less orthodox, politics more independent, thought freer, throughout all the newer regions. Kansas fought out the problem of slavery, with the aid of the nation. Thousands of men became freethinkers, and found in such books as I have named a constructive conception of the world and of life, which took them outside the churches. Within the churches there was growth of the more progressive denominations, and the assertion of the boldest practical ideas as to the real significance of religion. In the great West arose the Republican Party, and subsequently many another freedom-seeking political movement followed. In fact, the pioneer conditions made for freedom, emancipation, economic independence, and a broader outlook upon life in all directions.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

*(To be continued.)*

* It was at this time that I added the *e* to the family name. It seemed to me that Cooke looked better than Cook in print, and I began to write it in that manner. No one of the family has ever objected to my manner of writing the name, although the others, now rather numerous, continue the family tradition as to the manner of spelling it. I have never had any idea that the *e* gave the name a more aristocratic bearing, and it was merely a boyish fancy, retained largely because of habit.

## IN ONE ANOTHER'S LOVE

I claim you as my own, my very own, life of my life.
(So speaks the God in me unto the God in you.)

One only God am I, alike in every soul.
And so, and only so, can I be known.

In one another's love, O man!
Ye shall become possessors of my wisdom and my power.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

# Religion in Australia

According to the materialistic conception of history, religion, art, science, etc., are all the product of the economic and geographic life of any given people. There is a modicum of truth in that theory just as there is in any theory that has received wide acceptance. Its truth in regard to Australia is shown in the fact that the climatic conditions of the country have a very strong influence in making the people non-churchgoers.

Australia has a mild climate all the year round and the spare time of the people is spent in the open air—in sports, games, motoring, etc. One might almost say that the populace of Australia hark back to the primitive condition. I do not, of course, use the word primitive in any derogatory sense but as descriptive of a people to whom the natural life appeals strongly.

One notices immediately upon entering Australia that the Australians come more in contact with the sun and the open air than do the Americans. It is common to see brown, tanned skins on both men and women and there is a healthy color upon most of the faces. The interest in outdoor recreation is tremendous and cricket or tennis or football or racing is a never-ending source of small-talk.

This, of course, has an effect upon the organized religion of the country. The appeal here is to the body more than the mind and to a very large extent the serious appeal of worship, lectures, indoor meetings (except amusements) meets with little response.

Since coming to Australia I have been fortunate in being asked to lecture for organizations of widely divergent interests and, strange to say, in almost every case the noticeable feature has been the amazingly small attendance at any of the meetings. I meet with religious and social workers in many fields of activity here in Melbourne and one and all complain of the extremely low level of interest in serious subjects in Australia today.

Of course, a few generations ago church-going was a habit here in Australia as in U. S. and Great Britain. The mass of people went to church as a matter of course. There are many churches in Australia but they are for the most part empty. (One can, of course, say this of America, but not, I think, to the same extent.)

The tradition in Australia is 98% British and the churches are all of British origin. First comes the church of England, then the Presbyterian, then the Methodist, then the Baptist, then the Congregationalists, and so on. The Church of England is not the state church in Australia but to belong to it is the hallmark of "society." One need not attend many services but, to a large section of "society," one must belong.

The Presbyterians are strong here as there is a large Scotch element in the country. The Scots Church in Melbourne is one of the wealthiest in the country and was originally founded by rich squatters from Scotland. The Independent Congregational Church in Collins St., Melbourne, is extremely wealthy and its popular minister draws large crowds every Sunday. It is not because he is a great preacher so much as that the whole service appeals to a rather low type of religionist. The case of this last church is somewhat typical of Australia. It is one of the two largest and richest churches in Melbourne but it draws its revenue from rich city property and not from the contributions of members. It is filled to overflowing each Sunday by people from suburban congregational churches who leave their own little church in the lurch and go to the big church because then their sole responsibility to the cause of congregationalism consists in putting five cents in the collection box.

From a theological standpoint the churches here are decidedly backward. Doctrines that have long been discarded in the old country find ready acceptance here. Liberal religion is conspicuous by its absence and the few churches there are have a very hard struggle to keep afloat. Especially is this true of the Unitarian churches in Australia. The case of the Australian Church, where I am at present Associate Minister, is somewhat different.

This church was founded forty years ago by Dr. Charles Strong when he broke away from the Scots Church in Melbourne, of which he was then minister. The cause of his rupture at Scots Church was theological but what he said about certain dogmas was really not very outré and quite in line with the beliefs of many Presbyterian ministers in Scotland at that time. But the Presbyterians were extremely conservative and so Dr. Strong left them. He had an extremely large following, however, and a new liberal church, called the Australian Church, was quickly formed. A large building was erected capable of seating sixteen hundred persons and for a decade or so it was packed to overflowing. They had a fine choir and organ and Madame Ada Crossley was a member of the quartet.

There were some very rich people in the new movement at first but, strange to say, they did not pay for the new building but allowed a heavy mortgage to be taken upon it. Then, just before the Boer War, Dr. Strong became radical along sociological as well as along theological lines and his rich members did not like this at all. So one by one they left him with his barn of a church and the heavy mortgage. Then came the Boer War and Dr. Strong dared to be a Pro-Boer. This was a braver and more dangerous stand than a non-Australian might imagine. The Australians out-British the British in their patriotism and in both the Boer War and the Great War the war feeling ran very high indeed. So one can understand the risk that Dr. Strong took by championing the cause of the Boers. From that time the church began to loose its supporters. When the Great War came Dr. Strong was again pacifist and again there were many defections. Then the interest on the mortgage could no longer be met and so the building had to go and, for a time, the Australian Church was without a home. Now we have this new building in Russell St. and the church is fairly strong and prosperous. But no one can foretell the prospects for liberal religion in Australia; things look dark.

I do occasionally preach at crowded meetings elsewhere but they are such that I rub my eyes and wonder why on earth I have been invited. There is, for instance, the Sunday evening meeting at the Temperance Hall. One might call it a Religious Vaudeville with a religious sermon or address as an aside. All kinds of speakers preach—evangelists, Salvation Army officers, temperance orators, etc. The meeting is decidedly evangelistic and yet when I speak and give them liberal Christian talks they are quite satisfied to listen and applaud. It seems to me that the great mass of the people anywhere would listen and accept our teaching if the name did not frighten them.

But that is the brand of religion that they like here—

a kind of combination of Uplift and Soporific with an opportunity to join heartily in hymns of the Sankey and Moody type. Sermons and talks are not the things that interest even the people that *do* attend church so much as the emotions that are engendered by the services.

In America there are at least some signs of a real wave of spiritual religion but here in Australia one is forced to admit that the spiritual appeal is at a low ebb. In New Zealand two of our Unitarian churches have had to close their doors for lack of financial support and this means a lot where the liberal movements both of Australia and New Zealand can be counted on the fingers of both hands.

In my next writing I shall try to discover whether there is any sign of religion or social upliftment outside the churches.

*Melbourne, Australia.* HARRY TAYLOR.

## War, the Limit of Idiocy!

War is the very limit of human folly, the most idiotic procedure of which men are capable. The brutes are quite incapable of the like: they do not kill their kind collectively and seldom individually. War is doomed, not because it is horrible, not because it is wicked, but because it is foolish. Rousseau said that the rulers of states would refrain from war if they knew their own interests: "They do not need to be good, generous, disinterested, public-spirited, humane. They may be unjust, greedy, putting their own interests above everything else; we only ask that they shall not be fools." That seems a modest request, perhaps not too much to ask of the people of a country as enlightened as the United States today—"that they shall not be fools." One needs only to look at war in its stark reality to see that fools may be graded thus: first, plain ordinary fools; second, damned fools; third, believers in war.

There is no doctrine so palpably foolish as not to have been accepted by some people somewhere at some time. Today war is generally esteemed the only available means by which in certain circumstances precious human interests can be saved and human progress promoted. The prevalence of this theory does not prove its correctness. In fact it is sheer nonsense, abysmal folly. Apply a little common sense—just a few grains will suffice—to the subject and you will see that in the nature of the case war is always the worst course that can be chosen. Franklin was right when he said: "There never was a good war or a bad peace." For what is war? It is collective homicide. The immeasurable foolishness of it lies in this undeniable fact, to wit, that *a living human being is preferable to a corpse.* There may be individual exceptions to this statement, as defenders of capital punishment evidently hold. Something may be said for the legal killing by organized society of individuals that have proved themselves dangerous to human life. But in war the killing is not selective but indiscriminate. In war good men kill good men by wholesale; choice youth from universities kill choice youth from universities; honest, home-loving workingmen kill honest, home-loving workingmen; Christians kill Christians. The word that fits such conduct is *insanity.* It is irrationality without stint or limit. Bernard Shaw's remark in the World War was amply justified: "The longer I live, the more firmly I am convinced that the other planets use our earth as their lunatic asylum."

Invariably each belligerent group deems itself righteous and the enemy wicked. In point of fact, however, both sides inevitably sink to practically the same moral level far below the instinctive life of the brutes. The Moral Order inflicts on each side in the long run approximately the same punishment, which indicates that the transgression of each is approximately the same. History fully warrants the word of the Teacher whom Christians praise but do not follow: "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." If war were universal and perpetual, the race would speedily perish from the earth. Human life would be hell in the process of self-destruction.

No idealistic aims can possibly justify the collective destruction of human life, for even of the most commanding ideals it is true, as Jesus said of the Sabbath, that they were made for man and not man for them. However beautiful in themselves, ideals have no authority, value or reality, as far as we know—I here disregard the faith in a future life—save as they are bound up with living men, not corpses. The eye affords a helpful analogy. It is beautiful in itself, but only when it is an organ of the living body. Its function is to serve the life that nourishes it, and it perishes when that life ceases. To die to save one's eyes would be to sacrifice the greater to the less, and it would not save the eyes! Dying that one's country may live is likewise a self-defeating procedure the character of which is hidden by the unconscious assumption that relatively only a few of the people that constitute a country will ever do it. A country lives in the minds and hearts of its living citizens, not in corpses. If all the people of a country should die that that country might live, it would not live. If nine-tenths should die, it would be comparatively a very poor sort of country that would survive. Let those who prate how admirable it is to die for a country specify the maximum fraction of the population that may so die advantageously to the country, for evidently there is a limit. The limit being established, it will be well to inquire *whether there can be any certainty that it will not be exceeded in the passion that war engenders.*

Doubtless there are certain good things that the World War brought in the immense complex of its consequences. But the net result was immeasurable loss, immeasurable in particular because no one will ever know what potential artists, scientists, poets, inventors, medical discoverers, statesmen, saints and seers, by whom humanity would have been enriched, there were among the millions whom the war turned into corpses. We only know that a large part of the choice youth of the peoples that led the van of human progress have been killed before their promise could be fulfilled, that multitudes more will spend their years with impaired vitality and perverted minds and hearts. The dead can not be brought back to life. The loss is irreplaceable. Compared with this loss, which falls on both sides with approximate equality, the military issue, victory or defeat, is a trifling matter. Human life is the most precious thing in the world. "There is no wealth but life," said Ruskin; "that country is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human lives."

When we succumbed to the general madness and entered the World War, *we played the fool.* There you have it, plain and flat. To avoid another war—adapting Rousseau's language—we do not need to be good, generous, disinterested, public-spirited, humane. We may be unjust, greedy, putting our own interests above everything else; provided only *that we be not foolish.*

As the counterpart of Winston Churchill's striking "Shall We Commit Suicide?" let us ask, "Shall We Be Fools?"

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

# Fathers and Sons: A Case of Neophobia

Ah! here is an ant merrily dragging a half-dead fly. Drag away; my old friend, drag away! Don't be troubled by its resistance; you can, in your quality of animal, despise all feeling of pity. It is not like us who are voluntarily crushed and broken. . . . Yes, man is a strange creature. When one casts his eyes from one side and from a distance, over the obscure existence which the *fathers* lead here, it seems to be all very good. Eat, drink, and know that you conduct yourself in the most regular . . . manner. . . .

Man can comprehend everything; the undulations of ether and the changes which operate on the sun, but he will never comprehend that any one can wipe his face in a different way from his.

Thus Turgenev's ill-fated hero summarizes the eternal struggle between the torpid lassitude of insipid Age and the provoking buoyancy of kaleidoscopic Youth; between the benignant spirit of progressive innovation and the virulent instinct of insidious stagnation.

The "fittest" and successful fathers of to-day, as in the fermenting days of the Slavic renaissance, and after a laboriously sanctimonious career, are perfectly contented with the booties of the temporal, at the expense of the eternal, eating and drinking and glorifying in the consciousness that they are padding the pageant of their evanescent three score and ten in the most accepted phlegmatic "regular manner." As to their hilarious children (victims of the malignant disease of self-assertion), their annoying convolutions and resentments are silenced with scathing epithets, the more insubordinate being assigned to the dolorous companionship of Remus—that unmanageable twin brother of the founder of the fallen Rome whose life was cut short for the temerity of ridiculing the very walls of the then ill-aspiring new city. And now, too, as in the days of old, woe unto the institutions and spiritual tutors whose liberated propensities lean toward things celestial as opposed to things degrading and terrestrial, and who avow to divert the minds of truth-seeking children from vain curricula by teaching reason's ungarnished truths. Theirs is the recompense of all true iconoclasts: the hemlock of the now sullen Athens and the cross of the now grimy Nazareth.

What chances for genuine progress have the present and coming generations from the modern fathers, who are the foundation of civilized society? How do the fathers of to-day greet the attempt for sound reconstruction? An unhappy state of affairs is unveiled. The atavism of intolerance and persecution and neglect is resurrected from the orthodox past. And our modern mobs and institutions of law and learning repeat the familiar cries of a cruelly arrogating majority.

Hail Barabbas! Crucify conscience by uprooting its very matrix, assertive individuality! Behold the true apostles, the traitors of conventionality; the corrugated impostors corrupting the morals of our institutions and condescending youth! Are they not worthy of derision?

Sad enough: sad history does repeat itself. What a striking similarity between the passionate declarations of ancient Greece and Judea and the cries heard in our own streets. Hatred and fear for things new is the answer to the illogical attitude. It is a remarkable case of social neophobia, iterating itself continuously.

When bathtubs were making their first appearance in our country, it was deemed undemocratic and dangerous to bodily health, just as it is said to be unprogressive and dangerous to social well-being to have the children think dispassionately and disinterestedly of the future, and strive accordingly. In the former case the queen state of Puritanism rushed with an ordinance which made bathing unlawful except on medical advice (1845). In the latter case, the fathers of our empire state and many other sister states hasten with the promotion of laws which make independent thinking and conscientious teaching a crime, a social misdemeanor, frequently punishable with the loss of the means of a livelihood.

These are the salient facts in the relations between *"fathers"* and *"sons,"* the former impervious to things that do not suit them. To eat and drink and sleep; to distrust, mob, fight and cheat; and, in short, to conduct themselves at leisure in the "regular manner" is in vogue now among the fathers as in the darkest past, often to out-Herod Herod is the sole diversion. As to the little "humanity" that does crop out here and there, parading prominently in public, it may be thought fit to compare it (severe as it may be) to the generosity of the trader Haley, as Mrs. Stow pictures him in Uncle Tom's Cabin. He (the slave-dealer) believed that "a little humanity thrown in along, goes a heap farther than all the jawin' and crackin' "; for he learned from actual experience that "it pays."

To be sure, as faithful Philistines, evasive of higher callings and behind the shield of assiduous training through custom and habits, fathers do not feel immediate apprehension. Their traditional views of life offer an excellent prophylactic against the encroachments of the spirit of the morrow. This attitude inhibits the development of morbid phenomena and insures security and repose. But one can never tell when and where an overwhelming offensive is turned to a staggering defensive; where and when appalling sameness and pusillanimity of action might turn the scale against the confidence in the efficacy of an order that can boast of nothing else but frivolity, noxious sentimentalism, illimitable selfishness, irreparable depredation and impecunious masses. Is not the air poisoned even now with the rustling voices, sowing the seeds of resonant nihilism? Would it not be an act of highest wisdom to see age free its incarcerated soul and let it discern and commune with the rhythm of true, humane life? Are not the multitudes of infinitesimal signs of the day against wilful somnambulism. There is a call to make life grander; fathers wiser; children healthier (morally as well as physically); and there is plenty of work and workers. Why not make the passing days richer, worthier and virtuous?

How many fathers stop to consider the havoc their indifference adds to the present and coming generations; and how many young spirits are voluntarily crushed and broken as a result? Or, have fathers no "duties" save the right for self-adulation and squalid contentment? Why, one wonders, must fathers adhere to modes of thought and living that crush and break the very life of children; accepting beliefs that obliterate all signs of hope in a saner future? Why this intolerance of age and indifference to the genuine interests of posterity?

Age, by its very nature being a passing host, why not labor then to leave a cleaner house, a purer order, a nobler existence for the incoming heirs, asserting youth?

Youth, says Professor Miller of Oberlin in his message to the Student Forum, is "dogmatic" in its enthusiasm and idealism; while the pragmatic and the liberal belong to maturity. Here is the wide field where fathers and sons and daughters can and must meet for a common purpose, exchanging virtues for the common weal. There are rights and obligations mutually involved. And it is the privilege of pragmatic age to guide dogmatic youth, not at the expense of spiritual apprehension, but with a benevolent liberalism. In this manner can fathers fulfil their splendid mission without loss and dissimulation.

Ourselves, as we are seen by unbiased "outsiders," with "the average American . . . in our days like the average European—steel clad with prejudices coat upon coat" (George Brandes on The Cosmopolitan Ideal); and with our professors overworked, underpaid and deprived of all liberty of speech and conscience, from whom nothing can be expected, while the governing bodies are under the thumbs of the plutocrats who pay the piper and call the tune (George Bernard Shaw in his letter to the Intercollegiate League at the time of its formation); it remains to the integrity of the fathers of our day to rid itself of the shackels of neophobia and impress the now somber hues of an unhappy civilization with the happy colors of a jubilant future, ushering the era of individual and social, physical and moral human regeneration. Will fathers shirk the responsibilities of age? Are they willing to do their share and stand the test of the day? As they live, so goes their record; for history to pass judgment.

DAVID GITTLEMAN.

## THE STUDY TABLE

### A Charming Book*

Leonard Merrick is a cult, a cult which some of our best known English novelists try assiduously to cultivate in the public. The edition to which "Quaint Companions" belongs has introductions by well-known writers. This volume is prefaced by some entertaining pages of H. G. Wells. "The chief fault of 'Quaint Companions'," Mr. Wells declares, "is that it ends." And he goes on to say, "this book has not only the beginning and middle and end of one story, but the beginning and some of the middle of another." The intelligent reader would be the more glad if it went on to that second end, and even then, he might feel there was more to be said. For this book is about the tragedy of racial miscegenation. It is, perhaps, the most sympathetic and understanding novel, in its intimate, everyday way, about the clash of color and race prejudice and racial quality, that has ever been written in English.

Within his narrow circle of characters and incident, Leonard Merrick is a past master, and the Negro and his mulatto son, Elisha Lee and David Lee, move through a Merrick world and meet much the same women met by "Conrad in Quest of His Youth," and that the writer's other very human heroes encountered in stories of the theatrical world in England and of life among the artists in Paris. Here is the self-seeking woman with her power of destroying the artist, so delicately drawn, and the unselfish woman who brings comfort and something of happiness to the disillusioned hero.

The two Lees are very different types of men. The first is passionate, jealous, loveable. The second, his son, is shy, timid, very sensitive. Each loves a white woman. The father wins the pretty face that takes his fancy, only to be ruined by the selfish spirit that lies back of it. The son grows up amid a prejudice that is much greater, I must confess, than I had supposed any writer could depict in England. David is able to go to a private school, but his treatment by the boys there is as brutal as it would be in South Carolina. He is continually meeting with unkindness. When after his father's death, he goes to London he is utterly alone. It is there that he begins to write poetry and at length receives recognition. He enters into a correspondence with an unknown woman and this correspondence and its results makes up the slight plot of the story.

Wells much prefers the father who, as he says, has *guts*.

The following conversation shows the two characters. David has described to his father, who is a great singer, a poem he is writing depicting a fox hunt from the viewpoint of the fox. He ends with:

"It sounds like a game of savages, father."

"Whatever it is you won't alter it, sonny. You don't suppose you're going to make the world any better?"

This was really David's most sanguine hope, but he looked modest.

"Anyhow, I can write the truth," he said.

"The truth? Who the devil wants the truth?" replied the nigger.

"People hate the truth, especially English people; there's nothing English people detest so much. And they always deny it. . . . I'll tell you what you might do, if you feel like that—you might make it a bull-fight and go for the brutality of the foreigner. But even then it would be no good for music. If you want to do lyrics, you must write about love, or the valor of Englishmen. Nothing else is any use, nobody would sing this."

Note the casual way in which the writer, always sympathetic with his heroes, uses the term "nigger." I suspect the word will become a part of the English language until it drops out because it has no significance, no connotation or reproach, as "Paddy" the term for the once despised Irish, has done.

"Quaint Companions" is not a great book but it is a very charming one.

MARY WHITE OVINGTON.

* "Quaint Companions." By Leonard Merrick. Published by E. P. Dutton & Company, 681 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### AN APPEAL FOR JUDGE LINDSEY

Editor of UNITY:

May I write you a word about the fight being made by Judge Ben B. Lindsey of Denver to maintain his position as Judge of the Juvenile Court? I recently had a visit with him, in the course of which he explained the situation out there, and he has sent me a statement* of the situation. This statement contains no mention of the unbelievable abuse to which he, and especially Mrs. Lindsey, were subjected during the campaign. His enemies have contested his election but he can prove the alleged irregularities were in the main instigated by, or forced by, his enemies. However, the court action will be expensive and his enemies are counting on his lack of funds. He must have financial support.

He has been Judge of the Juvenile Court of Denver now for twenty-five years. During this time he has been a center of influence in this country for the liberalization of law and court procedure affecting domestic relations and children. At this the completion of a quarter century of distinguished service, shall we not count it a privilege to make come contribution to aid him at this last great fight against the despotic control of those who seem on the point of setting at naught the orderly processes of law?

Judge Lindsey receives a salary of $4,000 a year. His campaign expenses this last campaign were $2,400. In some campaigns his expenses have run as high as $10,000. So he has saved nothing. He and his wife live in a basement, and have to cut their personal expenses to the lowest point. She acts as his private secretary. In addition to the enormous work of the court and the campaigns, Judge Lindsey has had many voluntary probationers among boys, and Mrs. Lindsey has had hundreds of girl probationers who reform and lead a better life. She has fought by his side for eleven years and is as great a woman as he is a man. If Judge Lindsey is unseated he will have to leave Colorado, as he could not practice law in a state run by the Ku Klux Klan. On the other hand, if he can weather this storm, he can weather anything in the future. His address is Judge Ben B. Lindsey, Juvenile Court, Denver, Colorado.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES M. WILLIAMS.

*Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.*

### A NEW HYMNAL

Editor of UNITY:

There is in the Unitarian Fellowship the call for a wider choice of hymn, service and prayer than is found in our present Hymn and Tune Book—excellent as that collection is—which will emphasize those feelings of social aspiration and personal spiritual endeavor that mark the modern Liberal movement.

There is the call for a larger literature of public worship which will look toward the springs of action, as well as those of contemplation and communion, and which in phraseology and emphasis will be in complete harmony with a thorough-going Liberalism and the modern spirit.

The thought that is sung, or often repeated by the worshipper sometimes makes a deeper impress upon his consciousness than the words he hears from the pulpit. We find that the hymns and services, the creeds and rituals, of our orthodox childhood remain in our sentiments long after our minds have ceased to justify them.

The Liberal church often exhibits the anomaly of presenting from its pulpits the messages of Liberalism, while it continues to enforce in hymn and prayer and responsive service, through the medium of phraseology and word-picture, a certain orthodox emphasis.

If Unitarianism is to do its part in leading Liberal thought, its services of worship must evidence that leadership. The coming Centennial offers a fitting time for the collection and publication of a body of thoroughly liberal religious literature. No one thing, in the minds of some, will so revitalize the worship and spirit of our churches as to make available such a collection.

The task is not to be entered into hastily or unadvisedly, and the work of collecting, rejecting, editing and publishing is a matter to consume many months. The search will be long for material of a quality that will not only stimulate our minds and spirits, but will enrich our worship.

The self-constituted committee responsible for this letter hopes merely to make the beginning, from which may evolve the more finished and permanent product. At the most, it expects to gather a nucleus of material, which may be gone over and added to by a competent committee of our religious leaders, to be selected later by whatever method may be deemed the most expedient.

Dr. E. Stanton Hodgin of New Bedford has consented to act as the repositor for such material as may be submitted to him, and to assist in the preliminary work of sorting, unifying and appraising.

Already, there are in existence small collections of services reflecting the Liberal phraseology and spirit—possibly there are hymns. If there are such in your possession, will you not forward them at once to Dr. Hodgin, with permission to incorporate in a forthcoming collection as much as may be desirable, or at least for the purpose of comparison and suggestion?

I bespeak your hearty interest and prompt action in this project looking toward the sincerity and enrichment of our Liberal services of worship.

Sincerely,

*Florence, Massachusetts.* J. HARRY HOOPER.

### NEED OF AN INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONGRESS IN AMERICA

Editor of UNITY:

I read with great interest the article of Mrs. Julia Ellsworth Ford, on "Opium and British Policy," published in UNITY of March 2, 1925. Mrs. Ford's article breathes the spirit of sincerity in her wish to abolish the opium evil. We all know her to be an indefatigable worker in the cause. However I cannot agree with her conclusion; she says, "We feel that when the English people themselves come to understand the truth of the situation, they will demand a change of their Government's policy."

We cannot believe that this is the case. We are sure that the situation will change only after international pressure of world public opinion is brought against the British Government and people. It is fair to assume that we cannot expect that a British Tory or Liberal Government will be any more liberal and humane in their attitude on the opium evil than was the British Labor Government. We are fully convinced that the British Labor Party, with whose ideals and aspirations Mrs. Ford is in sympathy, has proved itself to be as imperialistic and conscienceless as the other parties.

Mrs. Ford and other Americans who think that the British people will aid in solving the opium problem, even though it be financially disadvantageous to them, should remember that it was the Government of the Rt. Hon. Ramsay MacDonald, which appointed Mr. Campbell of the India Office, to represent India in the League of Nations' International Conference, in spite of the known fact that in the past Mr. Campbell had opposed the American plan of suppressing the opium evil. It should not be forgotten that in the Legislative Assembly at Delhi, the Hon. Mr. Reddy, an Indian member of the legislature, presented a resolution against the appointment of Mr. Campbell and in favor of the American plan of restriction of production of opium for medicinal and scientific purposes only. Then Sir Basil Blackett, on behalf of the Government of India refused to allow the resolution even to be discussed, on the ground that the Legislature of India has nothing to do with India's Foreign Relations and all questions concerning the League of Nations concern His Imperial Majesty's Government. This was the attitude of the British Indian Government, *under the Labor Administration, which also inaugurated the iniquitous Ordinance in Bengal which is characterized by Mahatma Gandhi as the Lawless Law, by application of which a large number of Indian leaders have been put in prison without charge and trial.* We know that the British Labor Party represents the most progressive element of the British people and its leaders cannot be charged with ignorance concerning India, as Mr. MacDonald is himself the author of two splendid books on India ("The Awakening of India" and "The Government of India"); and Col. Wedgewood, Ben Spoor and lights of the Labor Party have visited India and written about the Indian situation quite intelligently. Mr. K. K. Kawakami, the author of "Japan in World Politics," etc., one of the early socialists of Japan, sometime ago wrote with a feeling of regret that even among the ranks of white socialists there is a double standard of justice —one for the white and one for the yellow, brown and black—and it is for the benefit of the white people and against the interest of the yellow, brown and black.

*The American people should thank themselves for the British attitude on the opium question, during the last International Opium Conference of the League of Nations.* It was Lord Robert Cecil, the British delegate to the International Opium

*See UNITY for February 16, p. 355.

## THE FIELD

*"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"*

### A MOREL MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

The true friend of the helpless and of the weak; the seeker out of wrong and injustice, his search never ending until the foul deeds were laid bare and corrected before a wondering world; brave in thought and brave in action; the defender of seemingly lost causes which by his unquenchable will were changed into glorious victories; choosing always the path toward freedom and light; the champion of peace and good-will for all peoples,—for the loss of such a man, the "very perfect gentle knight," E. D. Morel, do we, the members of the Executive Committee of the International Free Trade League, on behalf of the International Free Trade League, express our sorrow.

### TO STUDY THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

#### Owen D. Young in Great Speech Outlines Plan for Page Memorial School of International Relations.

"We have what one might call an industry of foreign relations, but we have no art. We have a trade, but we have no science. We have misinformation where we should have information. We have a desire of peace, but we have not established an agency whose exclusive duty it is to study how to get it," said Owen D. Young in announcing the plan for the Page Memorial School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins, February 23.

#### Plan for Page School Endowment

"We propose to establish a School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University with an initial endowment of not less than $1,000,000, for the purpose of inquiry and research as to how the nations and the peoples of the world may better live together in prosperity and in peace. (Applause.)

"We propose to accomplish that foundation for that purpose by asking the American people widely and generally to subscribe this modest sum as an initial gesture of their desire for peace and as a monument to the work and service of Walter Hines Page. (Applause.)

#### Science Has Outlawed Diseases

"We desire to outlaw war. Not so long ago we desired to outlaw the yellow fever. We desired to outlaw typhoid. We desired to outlaw diphtheria. We desired to shake off the enervating shackles of the hookworm. For centuries before, men had prayed and suffered.

"The plague and yellow fever, typhoid and diphtheria, the hookworm and malaria are outlawed in the world today. How was it accomplished? You all know the dramatic story. The patient research worker in his laboratory, seeking facts, building theories and testing them by experiments, showing not only devotion to his work but frequently a self-sacrifice which led to his death, came through victor.

#### Preventive Research Better Than Surgery of War

"Is it too much to expect that in the field of international diseases we might discover a disinfectant 50 times as powerful as guns to destroy disease germs in the international system? (Applause.) If so, we shall be able to parallel the announcement from Johns Hopkins of a discovery in another field 50 times as powerful as carbolic acid and yet harmless in its effect upon the human system. Disease in international relations must be destroyed. The health of the world must be guaranteed. This must be done by preventive research rather than by the surgery of war. (Applause.)

"The Page School will, therefore, achieve three things. First, it will develop a science of international relations; second, it will ascertain the facts, so far as they can be found, on any particular problem; and third, it will produce a continually growing body of men trained in that science and available for service in the fields of education, government and business.

#### Japanese Exclusion Act Defeated Washington Conference

"But let us turn to the more immediate and practical fields. A few years ago there met in Washington a great disarmament conference. It proceeded on the theory that reduction of arms would reduce wars.

"That is an experiment. It is a much more important experiment in psychology than in the physical destruction of materials. From it we may learn. But what happens next? A few months later, without careful study, without many facts, without restraint, either in act or word, without politeness, the Congress of the United States passes an immigration law under such circumstances as to offend the pride and dignity of a great nation in the Pacific, a nation with which we have every reason to live in peace and friendship.

"I cry again, Mr. President, for facts, for study, for calm consideration, for the restraint which goes with knowledge.

#### French Debt Issue Beclouded by Ignorance

"And then again, right now, we find irritation and misunderstanding between two great nations.

"And why, Mr. President? Because no impartial authority, free from the handicaps of domestic politics in either coun-

---

Conference, who led the opposition against the American plan with all vigor and ingenuity; and it is reasonable to think that the very selection of Lord Robert as the British delegate was influenced by the attitude of a very influential section of the American public towards him. It is known to all Americans interested in the suppression of opium evil that when Lord Robert Cecil was brought to America by the Foreign Policy Association, he opposed the stand of the American Government on the opium question and spread absolutely wrong information regarding it. But, in spite of this fact, when the American leaders of the Wilson Foundation, not being able to find an American equally worthy of recognition, presented the $25,000 prize to Lord Robert Cecil, the British Tory Government was justified in appointing Lord Robert as British delegate to the International Opium Conference with the hopes that he would be able to serve the British interests most effectively by winning over the members of the American delegation to the conference, to follow his leadership on the opium question.

The British people will succeed in changing the policy of their Government concerning the opium traffic when and only when it will be made clear to their governing class, that by continuing the policy of allowing the debauchery of the people of the Orient, particularly the people of India, and the Strait Settlements and other countries where it is supposed that Britain is spreading the light of civilization, they are rousing international public opinion against them, to such an extent that it will hurt them internationally, and not before. It will not be possible to rouse International public opinion unless the American people take the leadership. There will be difficulties, of course, because many very sincere Americans, worshipping the League of Nations in spite of all its defects and imperialistic functions, would not care to have an International Opium Conference in America. They think that it will hurt the prestige of Great Britain and the League.

We are told that any effort to call an International Opium Conference in America would mean censuring the actions of the League of Nations and interfering with the internal affairs of Great Britain. People who argue this way are those who spend American money to bring British opponents of American policy on the opium question, to America that they may influence American public opinion in favor of the League of Nations. These people sincerely feel that they are educating the American public. The world, particularly the American people, need education as to the *exact* situation regarding the international opium traffic which is carried on for profit. This educational campaign can be carried out effectively by holding an International Opium Congress in Washington or New York. An International Opium Congress which will be held in America and whose proceedings will receive the necessary publicity, will unmask the hypocrisy of the Powers engaged in profit and will cause the British governing class to change its shameful policy on the Opium question quicker than anything else. The other day Prof. Herbert Adams Gibbons in a lecture at the Town Hall, New York, pointed out the need of a change of political morality on the part of Great Britain in her treatment of the people of India, Egypt and other countries; and the time has come when the American people who have the sincere desire to save humanity from the curse of opium should concentrate their efforts to hold an International Opium Congress in America which will arouse the world conscience against drugging for profit. We sincerely hope that Mrs. Julia Ellsworth Ford and other Americans interested in the opium crusade will take leadership in bringing about an International Opium Conference, as suggested above, in the near future.

*New York City.* MARY K. DAS.

try, has been able to study the question of the fair amount or the practical method of payment of the French debt. I cry again for facts. I beg the politicians and statesmen of both countries to stop their harmful talk until the facts are found. In a great nation, littleness and selfishness alone are the enemies of its rights. (Applause.)

**America's Power Demands Intelligent Leadership in World Affairs**

"And so, Mr. President, I beg for this school now—now when America is entering on new responsibilities in the world's affairs. If our command of natural resources, inventive genius, productive application are to be exercised for the benefit and safety of the world, then we must learn how to do it. If our moral leadership is such that we may be the strongest force in the world for peace, then God be with us if we fail."

## INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

**News Sheet**

**U.S.A.**—*A Conference of Students,* organized by the Y.M.C.A., met at Asilomar, Monterey Bay, California, from December 27, 1924, to January 3, 1925. Five hundred students were present, 80 being foreigners and the rest from the Western States. Six had come from Hawaii, two from Mexico and one from British Columbia. The principal questions discussed were: the West Coast Interracial problem; Christianity and vital American social problems; Present Needs for men in full time Christian Service; Campus Conditions affecting full time Christian Life Service. Among the speakers were Bishop McConnell of Pittsburgh, Sherwood Eddy, Francis Miller, President N. F. Coleman of Reed College, Oregon, and T. Kagawa, a Japanese pastor from Kobe, Japan. Investigating commissions had been studying the problems under discussion for some time previously, and had therefore plenty of facts to lay before the delegates. Sherwood Eddy's verdict was that it was the best conference he had attended in thirty years for "frank discussion of vital problems and evidence of independent thinking and forward looking."

WAR

Fools, fools, fools,
Your blood is hot today.
It cools
When you are clay,
It joins the very clod
Wherein at last you see
The living God,
The loving God,
Which was your enemy.

*Grenstone Poems.* —*Witter Bynner.*

**It's a "Case" of Necessity**

**Your Printing will be above criticism if done by**

**THE OAKLAND PRESS**

**3913 Cottage Grove**
**Tel., Atlantic 1876**

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM
DOMESTIC
COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

*The* Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
*PRINTERS and BINDERS*
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

*Children Love It*

**BOWMAN'S MILK is a delightful treat for tiny tots. Its creamy richness gives them strength.**

BOWMAN DAIRY Company

*DREXEL State Bank*

**Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.**

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

***Your savings and checking account cordially invited***

***Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars***

***IN MARCH***

The expectant feeling of Spring is in the air. It's high time to get ready the new season's apparel—to start the big home cleaning. Therefore we suggest the cleansing of both garments and home furnishings by our process of continuous clarification—the most efficient possible.

*Schumann & Co*
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6231 : : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORK
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

**Subscribe for and read UNITY**